

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/902,110	Applicant(s) HOLM ET AL.	
	Examiner Jerry A. Lorengo	Art Unit 1734	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jerry A. Lorengo. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Paul Lewis. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 20 October 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 20 and 32.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,511,545 to Banno et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In response to the non-final action mailed 09/20/2004, Mr. Lewis contacted the Examiner with proposed amendments to applicant claims 20 and 32. Mr. Lewis suggested claim amendments to applicant claims 20 and 32 to more specifically define the manner in which the application and inspection deposit the viscous medium at a plurality of locations after which the regions of viscous media are inspected en masse. The Examiner indicated that he would consider any such changes when formally submitted and also indicated that any considerations would be in view of a further search of the salient prior art. .